

EXHIBIT P

From: [Foster Jr., William S.](#)
To: [Flynn, Michael J.](#)
Cc: [DiGiovanni, Francis](#); [Rahmeier, Thatcher](#)
Subject: Re: f"real/HBB - BIC2100YL
Date: Friday, September 20, 2019 12:05:28 PM

It's a BIC2000. It's no different for purposes of the patents. The model was also part of the numbers we provided in April so it was part of Akemann's royalty calculation at trial.

Thanks,
Bill

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 20, 2019, at 11:41 AM, Flynn, Michael J. <michael.flynn@mnat.com> wrote:

Bill,

Can you please confirm that there is no dispute that the BIC2100YL is also an infringing product based on the Court's findings and the jury verdict (subject to all of Defendants' post-trial and appeal rights)? The BIC2100YL was never disclosed during fact discovery, but Hamilton Beach did include it in the most recent accounting of sales (HBBF0172884) and presumably subject to supplemental damages.

We're just trying to understand if Hamilton Beach will be taking the position that the BIC2100YL should not be included among the other accused products for purposes of supplemental damages and/or a final judgment.

Thanks,
Michael

MICHAEL J. FLYNN

Partner | Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP

1201 North Market Street

P.O. Box 1347

Wilmington, DE 19899-1347

(302) 351-9661 Direct

mflynn@mnat.com | [vcard](#) | [bio](#) | www.mnat.com

This message, including any accompanying documents or attachments, may contain information that is confidential or that is privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please note that the dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this

message or any of the accompanying documents or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you believe that you may have received this message in error, please contact me at (302) 658-9200 or by return e-mail.